

Non equilibrium mode coupling theory for supercooled liquids and glasses

A. Latz

*Institut für Physik, Johannes Gutenberg Universität, Staudinger Weg 7, D-55099 Mainz,
Germany*

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

A formally exact set of equations is derived for the description of nonequilibrium phenomena in classical liquids and glasses. With the help of a non equilibrium projection operator formalism, the correlation functions and fluctuation propagators are expressed in terms of memory functions and time dependent collective frequencies. This formally exact set of equations is approximated by applying mode coupling approximations to the memory functions. The resulting set of equations for wavevector dependent correlation functions, fluctuation propagators and one-time structure factors $S_q(t)$ generalizes the well known mode coupling theory of the glass transition to situations far away from equilibrium.

I. INTRODUCTION

The mode coupling theory of the glass transition (MCT) is based on the experimental and theoretical understanding of dense liquids. Although approximative in nature, mode coupling theories were quite successful to describe quantitatively the dynamics of dense liquids close to the triple point. The dynamics of dense liquids is dominated by two mechanisms, the precursor of the cage effect and a complicated coupling of current fluctuations and density fluctuations. This coupling is the main cause of activated motion close to the glass transition [1,2] and will not be considered further in this paper. The cage effect is a collective phenomenon caused by the mutual hindering of the motion of the atoms or molecules due to the strong repulsion of the cores of the atoms. Instead of a unidirected flow-like motion a kind of stop and go mechanism is observed in simulations of dense liquids. The particles tend to rattle in a cage formed by the surrounding atoms. To escape this cage an atom has to find a hole in the surrounding wall formed by the other atoms. The same is of course true for the atoms building the wall. Due to the thermic motion a situation will arise in which the particles can pass each other. This process will be repeated over and over again. In this way the motion of particles, which are nearby at some instant of time, will decorrelate slowly. In the process a back flow pattern is created. By increasing the density, the local cage effect will eventually lead to a complete blocking of long range motion of the particles. They will be stuck in their local cages and thus form a glass. The details how this is done, especially how this glassification affects the various spatial scales are described by the idealized mode coupling theory [3]. Within this theory it is e.g. possible to understand the effect of the stiffening of the local cages on the thermodynamics and hydrodynamics close to the glass transition [4]. Experimentally observed phenomena like the frequency dependent specific heat are thus explained quite naturally in a unified framework.

The underlying mathematical mechanism of the glass transition in the idealized MCT is a bifurcation in the equation for the dynamics of the density - density correlation function of a system of N particles. Using a standard Mori projection operator formalism for the

density and current fluctuation $n_q(t), \vec{j}_q(t)$ with

$$n_q(t) = \exp(iLt)n_q(0) = \sum_i^N \exp(i\vec{q}\vec{r}_i(t)) \quad (1)$$

$$j_q(t) = \frac{\vec{q}}{q} \vec{j}_q(t) = \sum_i^N \frac{\vec{q}}{q} \vec{v}_i \exp(i\vec{q}\vec{r}_i(t)), \quad (2)$$

the following formally exact equation for the density density correlation function $\phi_q(t)$ can be derived:

$$\frac{d\phi(t)}{dt} = i\vec{q}\phi_{n,\vec{j}}(t) := iq\phi_{n,j} \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{d^2\phi(t)}{dt^2} = -\Omega_q^2\phi(t) - \int_0^t dt' \frac{d\phi(t')}{dt'} M(t-t'). \quad (4)$$

Here the correlation function ϕ is given as

$$\phi(t) \equiv \phi_{nn}(t) = (n_q|n_q(t)) := Tr(\exp(-\beta H)n_q^*(0)n_q(t)) \quad (5)$$

L is the Liouville operator. Its action on some dynamic variable is defined by the Poisson bracket

$$LA = -i \sum_i^N \{H, A\}. \quad (6)$$

By construction the memory function M is free of any hydrodynamic singularity and cannot be expressed as a linear functional of the correlation functions. Instead it can be written as a correlation function of fluctuation forces.

$$M_q(t) = (QLj_q | \exp(iLQt)QLj_q) / S_{jj}. \quad (7)$$

S_{jj} is the static current current fluctuation function. In equilibrium it is given as

$$S_{jj} = Nk_B T / m \quad (8)$$

where m is the mass of an atom and T is the equilibrium temperature. In the mode coupling approximation the fluctuating forces are approximated as a superposition of two mode contributions [3]

$$QLj_q \approx \sum_{kp} v(q|kp) n_k n_p \quad (9)$$

$$v(q|kp) = (QLj_q | n_k n_p) (S_k S_p)^{-1} = \delta_{\vec{p}, \vec{q}-\vec{k}} S_{jj} \hat{v}(k, q-k) \quad (10)$$

The second equality in eq. (10) is due to momentum conservation. S_q is the static structure factor $\phi(q, t=0)$. The vertex $\hat{v}$ can be evaluated in equilibrium. Neglecting static direct three point correlation functions the memory function is given by [3]

$$M_q(t) = n(k_B T/m)^2 \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \hat{v}^2(k, q-k) \phi(q-k, t) \phi(k, t) \quad (11)$$

with

$$\hat{v}(k, q-k) = (\vec{k} \frac{\vec{q}}{q} c_k + (\vec{q} - \vec{k}) \frac{\vec{q}}{q} c_{q-k})^2 \quad (12)$$

Here c_q is the (equilibrium) direct correlation function. Eqn 4 and 11 form a closed set of equations for the density - density correlation function in equilibrium. The solution properties of the above equilibrium MCT (EMCT) equation are very well known [6]. They exhibit an ideal glass transition as a bifurcation scenario from an ergodic to a non ergodic state. The transition temperature T_c (or density, pressure ...) is independent of the cooling rate since it is an equilibrium property of the system. By approaching T_c the structural relaxation is dramatically slowing down, developing the typical two step relaxation pattern of β - and α - relaxation. The EMCT was quantitatively tested for a experimental realization of a hard sphere system [7]. Without any fit factor (up to an overall scale factor) it is possible to reproduce with 20 % accuracy the density - density correlation for the wavevector at the peak of the structure factor. With the same kind of approximations for memoryfunctions the theory was also quantitatively tested for a binary Lennard Jones systems [8], a system of dumbbells [9] and a model system for water [10]. Any generalization to non equilibrium situations should therefore in equilibrium reduce to the above set of equations (4) and (11).

The non equilibrium situations to be described in this paper arise if one investigates the relaxation in a system, which is not yet equilibrated. When cooling down from some temperature $T_1 > T_c$ to $T_2 > T_c$, one has to wait at least for some time t_w comparable

to a typical α - relaxation time $\tau_q(T_2)$ to guarantee equilibration at the temperature T_2 . As indicated, the α - relaxation time τ_q depends on the wavevector q . To use the EMCT, density fluctuations for all wavevectors have to be equilibrated. For hard sphere like systems the largest α - relaxation time is given by the wavevector at the peak of the structure factor i.e only for a time $t_w > \tau(q_{max})$ the above equations are able to describe the density correlation functions. For times smaller than $\tau(q_{max})$ nonequilibrium effects like breaking of time translation invariance are to be expected. E.g. the one-time structure factor $S_q(t) = \phi_q(t, t)$ is time dependent, since the probability density has not yet reached its equilibrium value.

As soon as the system is quenched below T_c , the behavior of the system changes qualitatively. In EMCT the α relaxation time is going to infinity for all wavevectors, when T is approaching T_c from above, i.e. the system never reaches equilibrium for $T \leq T_c$. This means that e.g. even for infinite long waiting time the one-time structure factor will be different from the value, it would reach in the presence of hopping processes. For real systems, where activated processes cannot be neglected, the waiting time has to be smaller than the inverse of the typical hopping rate, in order to see aging. Therefore the applicability of EMCT has to be reconsidered within the larger framework of a theory, which is applicable also in nonequilibrium situations.

In the theory of spin glasses quite some progress in this direction was obtained in recent years. Already Kirkpatrick, Thirumalai [11] showed that the dynamics of an infinite ranged p - spin system with $p \geq 2$ and a disordered Potts system ($p > 4$) exhibit great similarities to the dynamics of structural glasses at least close to the critical temperature T_c (which is in the spin glass literature called T_D). The equation for the correlation function for $T > T_c$ reduce to a schematic EMCT model of the glass transition. For $p = 3$ the p - spin model is equivalent to the so called Leutheusser model [12] above T_c . This model exhibits a glass transition, but its α - relaxation is a simple exponential relaxation and can therefore

not explain the typical stretched relaxation observed in real glasses.¹ In the context of supercooled liquids the Leutheusser model can only be motivated by the complete neglect of the wave vector dependence in equ. (4,11). For the p - spin model the Leutheusser model is an exact theory due to the mean field character of this system. Cugliandolo and Kurchan showed for the p - spin model, that the EMCT is not valid any more below T_c , due to similar reasons as explained above [13]. Instead they derived nonequilibrium mode coupling equations for this model and solved them asymptotically below T_c . Contrary to the EMCT, the dynamics cannot be understood in terms of correlation function alone, but a coupled set of equations for the correlation functions $\phi(t_w, t)$ and susceptibilities $\chi(t_w, t)$ is necessary.

The most interesting property of the solution of these equations is the separation of the dynamics in a short time part, where the fluctuation dissipation theorem (FDT) is obeyed and an aging part where FDT is violated in a very specific way. In the aging regime the equations for $\phi(t_w, t), \chi(t_w, t)$ can be reduced to a single equation for a function $\hat{\phi}(\lambda)$ with $\lambda = h(t_w)/h(t)$. The susceptibility is given as

$$\chi(t_w, t) = \frac{h'(t_w)}{h(t)} \hat{\chi}(\lambda) \quad (13)$$

$$\hat{\chi}(\lambda) = \frac{x}{T} \frac{d\hat{\phi}}{d\lambda}$$

The function h has to be determined by matching the FDT solution and the aging regime. So far its form is only known for the spin glass with $p = 2$ [14]. The term $\frac{T}{x}$ was interpreted as an effective temperature [15]. Since the important work of Cugliandolo and Kurchan a large number of papers has addressed the problem of nonequilibrium relaxations in mean field models [16]. It was shown for general nonlinear Φ^n fieldtheories that in the cases where NMCT equations are exact, a mapping to an equivalent disordered problem can be found [17]. This can also be achieved by deterministic but highly irregular interactions [18].

¹It is possible to consider a more general class of schematic models, which show non exponential relaxation [6], but they are not easy to justify within the theory of liquids.

Simulation of binary liquids in the out of equilibrium regime [19–22] exhibit striking qualitative similarities to the dynamics found in the p -spin model. There is the separation in FDT and aging regime. Also the scaling behaviour (13) seems to be fulfilled. It is worth mentioning, that the crossover from the FDT regime to the aging regime, i.e. the behaviour of the function $x(t_w, t)$, seems to be different than in the p -spin model. To be able to describe behaviour of real liquids the schematic models are not sufficient, since they lack the important wavevector dependence, leading e.g. to non exponential relaxation and experimentally testable results like wavevector dependent Kohlrausch exponents [23]. Equations for multicomponent models have been formulated on an abstract level [17,24], but their relation to the theory of glass forming liquids is not obvious. Additionally there are no equations for the one time structure factor $S_q(t)$ for real liquids. In the following, I am going to formulate a generalization of the EMCT for real liquids, which will enable the study of the dynamics of real liquids above and below T_c in equilibrium and nonequilibrium situations.

II. THE NONEQUILIBRIUM PROJECTION OPERATOR FORMALISM

The main reason for the appearance of generic nonequilibrium relaxation is the inability of the system to equilibrate below T_c (if hopping is neglected, which I will assume in the following). To keep the formalism as simple as possible, I will consider a situation where the probability density ρ_{NE} is different from the canonical ($\rho \neq \exp(-\beta H)$) or other equilibrium densities but the microscopic dynamics is still Hamiltonian. The only requirement for not being in equilibrium is

$$\{\rho_{NE}, H\} \neq 0 \quad (14)$$

This situation may e.g. arise if the system is isolated after an initial quench from an equilibrated liquid above T_c to a glass below T_c (e.g. by coupling to an external heat bath, whose temperature is below T_c). The system tries to get into equilibrium with the heat bath.

As argued in [4] it can be expected that the kinetic energy is equilibrating on microscopic time scales. It is the potential energy which does not reach its equilibrium value due to its contribution from structural relaxations. After the initial quench we may therefore expect to describe the system with an initial density operator $\rho_{NE} = \exp(-(\beta_f K + \beta_I \epsilon^{pot}))$. Here β_I is the inverse of the initial temperature before the quench and β_f is the inverse of the final temperature. For $\beta_c = 1/(k_B T_c)$ the relation $\beta_I < \beta_c < \beta_f$ is fulfilled. K, ϵ^{pot} is the kinetic and potential energy respectively. If needed the formalism can also be developed by assuming a coupling to an external heat bath by using a Gaussian thermostat to guarantee the average of the kinetic energy being constant at any time [25], but here I want to concentrate on the more simple case of an isolated system described by a nonequilibrium density operator.

As basic variables for the following projection operator formalism (POF) $A_i(t)$ I again will use density fluctuations (1) and current fluctuations (2). The energy fluctuations are neglected. They are of course influenced by the glass transition, but they do not qualitatively change the glass transition scenario [4]. The main idea of any projection operator formalism is to separate the dynamics of the variables in a part directly proportional to a chosen variable, a part which is given by the fluctuation of the variables in the past and a fluctuating force, whose dynamic was never directly proportional to the fluctuations of the basic variable $\delta A_i(t)$. The most direct generalization of the standard Mori formalism to situations, in which also equal time correlation functions are time dependent is obtained by using [27–29]

$$\bar{P}(t) = \exp(-iLt) \delta A_i(0) \mathbf{S}_{ik}^{-1}(t) \delta A_k(t) \exp(iLt) \quad (15)$$

$$:= \exp(-iLt) |A_i(0)\rangle \mathbf{S}_{ik}^{-1}(t) \langle A_k(t)| \exp(iLt)$$

$$\bar{Q}(t) = 1 - \bar{P}(t) \quad (16)$$

Equal indices are summed over. In equilibrium this projection operators reduces to the time independent Mori projection operator in equilibrium. The matrix $\mathbf{S}$ is the equal time correlation matrix of the variables A_i

$$\mathbf{S}_{ik} = (A_i(t) | A_k(t)) = Tr(\rho_{NE} \exp(iLt) A_i(0) | \exp(iLt) A_k(0)). \quad (17)$$

The projection operators have the following properties.

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{P}(t_1)\bar{P}(t_2) &= \bar{P}(t_2) \\
\bar{Q}(t_1)\bar{Q}(t_2) &= \bar{Q}(t_1) \\
\bar{Q}(t_2)\bar{P}(t_1) &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

With the help of (15,16) a formally exact set of equations for the fluctuation of the density (1) and the current (2) can be derived

$$\frac{dn_q(t)}{dt} = iqj_q(t) \tag{19}$$

$$\frac{dj_q(t)}{dt} = iLj_q = \tag{20}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& i\delta n_q(t)q^2\Omega_{nj}(t) + i\delta j_q(t)q^2\Omega_{jj}(t) \\
& - \int_{t_w}^t dt' \delta n_q(t')\mathbf{S}_{nj}^{-1}(t')M_q(t', t) - \int_{t_w}^t dt' \delta j_q(t')\mathbf{S}_{jj}^{-1}(t')M_q(t', t) \\
& + i\exp(iLt_w)\bar{Q}(t_w)G(t_w, t)L\delta j_q(0)
\end{aligned}$$

The structure of the equation is very similar to the equilibrium equation. Eq. (19) is simply the continuity equation for the density. $q^2\Omega_{nj}, q^2\Omega_{jj}$ are generalized time dependent frequencies. They are given by

$$\Omega_{nj} = S_{nn}^{-1}(t)(n_q(t)|Lj_q(t))/q + S_{nj}^{-1}(t)(j_q(t)|Lj_q(t))/q \tag{21}$$

$$\Omega_{jj} = S_{jn}^{-1}(t)(n_q(t)|Lj_q(t))/q + S_{jj}^{-1}(t)(j_q(t)|Lj_q(t))/q \tag{22}$$

In equilibrium Ω_{jj} would be zero due to time translational invariance, but has to be kept in nonequilibrium for finite times. The memory function M_q is an explicit function of two times.

$$M_q(t_1, t) = (Lj_q(t_1)|\exp(iLt_w)\bar{Q}(t_w)G(t_w, t)L\delta j_q(0)) \tag{23}$$

$$G(t_1, t) = \mathcal{T} \exp(i \int_{t_1}^t dt' L\bar{Q}(t')) \tag{24}$$

Where the operator $\mathcal{T}$ induces a time ordering from left to right. It is important to note that in general the memory function (23) does not have the form of a correlation function

of fluctuating forces, but is the correlation of the accumulated random force between t_1 and t and the real force $Lj_q(t_1)$ at time t_1 . It describes the dissipation between t_1 and t [28]. This will be important for finding appropriate approximations. The last term in (20) is a fluctuating force $F_q(t_w, t)$

$$F_q(t_w, t) = \exp(iLt_w)\bar{Q}(t_w)G(t_w, t)Lj_q(0). \quad (25)$$

Due to the properties of the projection operators (18) the time ordered product in (24) propagates the force Lj_q always in the space of functions perpendicular to density and current at every time step. The fluctuating force $F_q(t_w, t)$ is not correlated with the fluctuation of density or current at time t_w .

Equ. (19, 20) have the form of an inhomogeneous integro differential equation. They can be solved formally by introducing fluctuation propagators N_{kl} , which obey the homogeneous part of equ. (19, 20).

$$\frac{dN_{in}(q; t_1, t)}{dt} = iqN_{ij}(q; t_1, t) \quad (26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dN_{ij}(q; t_1, t)}{dt} &= iN_{in}(q; t_1,)\Omega_{nj}(t) + iN_{ij}(q; t_1, t)\Omega_{jj}(t) \\ &\quad - \int_{t_w}^t dt' N_{in}(q; t_1, t')\mathbf{S}_{nj}^{-1}(t')M_q(t', t) \\ &\quad - \int_{t_w}^t dt' N_{ij}(q; t_1, t')\mathbf{S}_{jj}^{-1}(t')M_q(t', t) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

The initial conditions are $N_{ik}(q; t, t) = \delta_{ik}$. If a density or current fluctuation is given at a time t_1 e.g. by applying a known external field to the system, the fluctuations at all later times are then given given by

$$\delta n_q(t) = \delta A_i(t_1)N_{in}(q; t_1, t) + i \int_{t_1}^t F_q(t_1, t')N_{jn}(t', t) \quad (28)$$

$$\delta j_q(t) = \delta A_i(t_1)N_{ij}(q; t_1, t) + i \int_{t_1}^t F_q(t_1, t')N_{jj}(t', t), \quad (29)$$

where $F_q(t_1, t)$ is the random force eq. (25). The A_i are density and current respectively for $i = 1, 2$. This can easily be checked by replacing density and current in equ. (19,20) by (28, 29).

The fluctuation propagators are very closely related to the susceptibilities. These are given by Poisson brackets of the variables [28].

$$\chi_{ik} = \langle \{ \delta A_i^*(t_1), \delta A_k(t) \} \rangle \quad (30)$$

The density susceptibility can therefore be written with the help of eq. (28) as

$$\chi_{nn}(t_1, t) = -iqN_{jn}(t_1, t) + i \int_{t_1}^t \langle \{ n_q^*(t_1), F_q(t_1, t') \} N_{jn}(t', t) \rangle \quad (31)$$

Here it was used that $\chi_{nn}(t_1, t_1) = 0$ and $\chi_{nj}(q; t_1, t_1) = -iq$. In mode coupling approximation, the second term in (31) is zero [26]. The dynamical susceptibility can therefore be identified with the fluctuation propagator $-iqN_{jn}(q; t_1, t)$.

The equation for the density correlation function can be easily derived from eqs. (19,20,28).

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 \phi_q(t_1, t)}{dt^2} = & -\phi_q(t_1, t) q^2 \Omega_{nj}(t) + i \frac{d\phi_q(t_1, t)}{dt} q \Omega_{jj}(t) \\ & -iq \int_0^t dt' \phi_q(t_1, t') \mathbf{S}_{nj}^{-1}(t') M_q(t', t) \\ & - \int_0^t dt' \frac{d\phi_q(t_1, t')}{dt'} \mathbf{S}_{jj}^{-1}(t') M_q(t', t) \\ & + \int_0^{t_1} (-iqN_{jn}(q; t', t_1)) \bar{M}_q(t', t) \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The function $\bar{M}_q(t', t)$ is in general not identical to the memory function $M_q(t_1, t)$ in (23), but it is the correlation function of the fluctuating forces.

$$\bar{M}_q(t_1, t) = (\bar{Q}(0)F_q(0, t_1)|\bar{Q}(0)F_q(0, t)) \quad (33)$$

Eqs. (32,27) are a formally exact set of equations for density correlation function and fluctuation propagators, which reduces to the response or integrated response within mode coupling theory. If we assume equilibrium, i.e. if we use the canonical ensemble, the set of equations reduces exactly to the one in equilibrium [26]. Time translation invariance is restored, the fluctuation propagator $N_{nn}(t_1, t)$ is identical to the normalized correlation function, $\bar{M} = M$ and the equation (32) reduces to (4) with $q^2 \Omega_{nj} = \Omega_q^2$.

For nonequilibrium situations a further step has to be taken. In EMCT the only input needed is the static structure factor. The frequency Ω_q can easily be calculated if $S(q)$ is known. In nonequilibrium $S(q)$ turns into a time dependent function. E.g. for quenches we only know the value of $S_q(t=0)$, which is just the equilibrium structure factor of the liquid at the begin of the quench. The equations presented so far, do not provide an equation for the equal time correlation function. It is easily possible to obtain an equation by differentiating twice $S_q(t)$.

$$\frac{d^2 S_q(t)}{dt^2} = 2q^2(j_q(t)|j_q(t)) - 2Re((n_q(t)|Lj(t)) \quad (34)$$

Equations like this cannot be treated with the standard non equilibrium projection operator formalism, since it is assuming implicitly that frequencies like $q(n_q|Lj_q)$ are known or can be simply calculated. This is not the case for liquids close to the glass transition in nonequilibrium. Due to $L\rho_{NE} \neq 0$ the Liouville operator is not a self adjoint operator like in equilibrium. Therefore $(n_q|Lj_q) \neq (Ln_q|j_q)$ and can therefore not simply be calculated. One possibility is to express the frequencies $\Omega_{nj}(t)$ and $\Omega_{jj}(t)$ with the help of a modified projection operator [26] by the one time structure factor, correlation functions and susceptibilities. The equation (34) can therefore be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2 S_q(t)}{dt^2} = & S_{jj}(t) - Re[S_q(t) q^2 \Omega_{nj}(0) + S_{nj}(q; t) q^2 \Omega_{jj}(0) \\ & + iq \int_0^t dt' \phi_{nl}(t, t') \mathbf{S}_{lm}^{-1}(0) W_{mj}(q; t', t) \\ & - q \int_0^t dt' \frac{\phi_{nl}(q; t, t')}{dt'} \mathbf{S}_{lm}^{-1}(0) U_{mj}(t', t) \\ & - \int_0^t (-iq N_{jn}(q; t', t))^* \bar{M}_q(t', t)] \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

There appear 4 new memory functions W_{mj} and U_{mj} with $m = 1, 2$ in this equation. W_{mj} , U_{mj} are the correlation functions of the fluctuation of the variable $A_m(0) \in (n_q, j_q)$ and the current of the fluctuating force $LF_q(t', t)$ between t' and t or the fluctuating force respectively, translated backwards in time to $t = 0$.

$$W_{mj}(t', t) = (A_m(0)| \exp(-iLt') LF_q(t', t)) \quad (36)$$

$$U_{mj}(t', t) = (A_m(0)| \exp(-iLt') F_q(t', t)) \quad (37)$$

In equilibrium the memory function U vanishes exactly. The fluctuating force $F_q(t', t)$ is perpendicular to $A_m(t')$ and $U_{mj}(t', t) \equiv (\exp(+iLt')A_m(0)|F_q(t', t)) \equiv 0$. The memoryfunction W_{nj} is in equilibrium equal to the fluctuating force correlation function $\bar{M}_q$. Together with the fluctuation dissipation theorem therefore the convolution integrals in time in (35) cancel. The first line in (35) vanishes, since in equilibrium $\Omega_{jj} \equiv 0$ and $q^2\Omega_{nj} = S_{jj}/S_q$. Equations (35,32,26) and (27) are an exact set of equations for one time and two time quantities, describing the change of the structure and the correlations and susceptibilities if e.g. by an initial quench a nonequilibrium probability density is imposed.

III. APPROXIMATIONS

To close the equations, closure relations for the memoryfunctions M_q, W_{mj}, U_{mj} and the correlation function of fluctuation forces $\bar{M}_q$ have to be found. There is no systematic way of calculating the memory function, since no small parameter is available for dense liquids close to the glass transition. The only guide available is the requirement, that the equations should reduce to the equ. (11) and (4) in equilibrium and that certain mathematical requirement intrinsic to the projection operator formalism are fulfilled. It is very plausible to express $\bar{M}$ as a quadratic form of the correlation functions since it has the structure of a correlation function of fluctuating forces.

$$\bar{M}(q; t_1, t) = \frac{1}{2} S_{jj}^2(t) \sum_k v^2(q; k, q - k; t) \phi_k(t_1, t) \phi_{q-k}(t_1, t). \quad (38)$$

The vertex $v(q; k, q - k; t)$ is the same as in (12) if the direct correlation functions are understood as time dependent quantities. The memoryfunction M describes the influence of a force fluctuation at t' on its surrounding integrated between t' and t . Since M cannot be written as a linear functional of the integrated response the next simple approximation possible is the following:

$$M(q; t_1, t) = M_q(t, t) - S_{jj}^2(t_1) \sum_k \int_{t_1}^t dt' v^2(q; k, q - k; t') (-ik) N_{jn}(k; t', t) \phi_{q-k}(t', t) \quad (39)$$

where $N_{jn}(k; t', t)$ can be identified with the susceptibility as explained above. In equilibrium this guarantees, that $M_q = \bar{M}_q$. Therefore the two last integrals in eq. (32) cancel for times $t_1 = t$. This property has to be fulfilled rigorously [25]. It can therefore be used to calculate $M(t, t)$ selfconsistently. Although M and $\bar{M}$ are equal in equilibrium, the formal expressions in nonequilibrium are different. Choosing $M = \bar{M}$ has the consequence that a generalized fluctuation theorem of the second kind [28] would be fulfilled. It can be shown [25] that this immediately excludes the possibility of the aging properties found e.g. in simulations [20] - [22]. Only a transient aging phenomena caused by the time dependence of the static structure factors would be observed in this case. Another possibility to introduce approximations is first to integrate the third integral in (32) by parts. This leads to

$$\frac{d^2\phi_q(t_1, t)}{dt^2} = -\phi_q(t_1, t) q^2\Omega_{nj}(t) + i\frac{d\phi_q(t_1, t)}{dt}q\Omega_{jj}(t) \quad (40)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & -S_q(t)M(t, t) + \phi_q(t, 0)M(0, t) \\ & + \int_0^t dt' \phi_q(t_1, t')\Sigma(t', t) \\ & + \int_0^{t_1} (-iqN_{jn}(q; t', t_1))\bar{M}_q(t', t) \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

with

$$\Sigma(t', t) = \mathbf{S}_{jj}^{-1}(t')\frac{dM_q(t', t)}{dt'} - iq\mathbf{S}_{nj}^{-1}(t')M_q(t', t) \quad (42)$$

With the approximation

$$M(q; t_1, t) = S_{jj}^2(t_1) \sum_k v^2(q; k, q - k; t) N_{jn}(k; t_1, t) \phi(q - k; t_1, t) \quad (43)$$

the resulting structure of the theory is very similar to the one of the p - spin model [13]. This is also true for the theory introduced by the approximations (38, 39). Both reduce to EMCT in equilibrium. Which of the approximations is more appropriate for real liquids has to be tested and is part of future work.

Similar approximations are possible for the new memory functions U and W . But since there are less mathematical boundary conditions to be fulfilled than for M and $\bar{M}$ there is more freedom in the choice of the approximation. Different approximation will lead only to quantitatively but not qualitatively different results for S_q .

IV. CONCLUSIONS

With the help of non equilibrium projection operator techniques it is possible to derive an exact set of equations for one-time quantities like the time dependent equal time structure factor and two-time quantities like correlation functions and fluctuation propagators. The memory functions can be approximated as in the EMCT by the correlation functions and response functions. It is interesting to note that in the formulation presented here, a theory for the equal time structure factor (which is trivial in the p - spin model) and not the potential energy as in the p -spin model is derived. The structure factor is directly accessible to experiments and it would be especially interesting to study aging phenomena in colloidal hard sphere glasses as it is done for colloidal clays [30], where the structure factor can easily be measured within light scattering experiments. It is already obvious from the equations, that the structure factor $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} S_q(t)$ in the glass will not be the structure factor of the corresponding equilibrium liquid, but will depend on the nonergodicity parameters i.e. on $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{t_w \rightarrow \infty} \phi_q(t_w, t)$ via the memory functions W_{jj}, U_{nj} and the correlation function of fluctuating forces $\bar{M}$. The aging scenario to be expected from the equations presented here can be formulated within the bifurcation scenario of the glass transition derived from mode coupling theory [6]. This picture can best be explained in discretized models, where only a discretized set of wave vectors is used. In this case the wavevector components of the equilibrium structure factor S_q^{equ} can be considered as control parameter of the mode coupling models. In the space formed by the components exists a critical hypersurface which separates the control parameter space in a liquid subset and a glassy subset. Since in the nonequilibrium case the value of $S_q(t)$ for $t \rightarrow \infty$ depends on the nonergodicity parameters, the critical hypersurface will also depend on the two time correlation function. A quench can now be considered in the following way. By starting in the liquid subset the system, which can be considered as a point in the control parameter space, starts to flow towards the critical hypersurface. As it approaches this surface relaxations become slower and slower. Due to the glass transition at the critical hypersurface the system can not reach the point,

which would correspond to the thermodynamic parameters in equilibrium. Instead it will very likely be trapped on the (nonequilibrium) critical hypersurface, which also depends on the nonergodicity parameters. In hard core like systems the glass transition is driven by the nearest neighbour repulsion. This can be inferred from the fact, that in the EMCT equations the glass transition occurs, if the first peak of the structure factor becomes big enough. Therefore trapping on the critical hypersurface will lead to a drastic change in the sensitivity of the peak height on the quench temperature (or density), once the system is quenched below T_c (above n_c). This qualitative aspect can be seen in simulations of binary Lennard Jones systems [22]. In this simulation the area under the first peak of the radial distribution function $g(r)$, which roughly corresponds to the height of the first peak of the structure factor S_q , does not seem to increase beyond a certain threshold, if the system is quenched below T_c . As a next step the details of the theory presented will be studied in simplified models before calculating the properties of realistic glass forming liquids. This will be part of future studies.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank R. Schilling for his interest and support during the development of the formalism and Leticia Cugliandolo and Walter Kob for interesting discussions and a critical reading of the manuscript. The work is partially supported by the Sonderforschungsbereich 262 of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Götze and L. Sjögren *Z. Phys. B* **65**, 415 (1987).
- [2] S. P. Das and G. Mazenko, *Phys. Rev. A* **34**, 2265 (1986).
- [3] U. Bengtzelius, W. Götze, and A. Sjölander, *J. Phys. C* **17**, 5915 (1984).
- [4] W. Götze and A. Latz, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **1**, 4169 (1998). 5833 (1998).
- [5] R. Schilling and T. Scheidsteiger, *Phys. Rev. E* **56** 2932 (1997). T. Scheidsteiger and R. Schilling, *Phil. Mag. B* **77** 305 (1998).
- [6] W. Götze, in *Liquids, Freezing and Glass Transition*, ed. J.P. Hansen, D. Levesque and J. Zinn-Justin, Les Houches Session LI, 1989 (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991).
- [7] M. Fuchs, W. Götze, S. Hildebrand and A. Latz, *Z. Phys. B* **87**, 43 (1992); W. van Meegen and S. M. Underwood *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 2766 (1993).
- [8] M. Nauroth, PhD thesis Technical University of Munich (1999).
- [9] S. Kämmerer, W. Kob and R. Schilling, *Phys. Rev. E* **56** 5397 (1997). S. Kämmerer, W. Kob and R. Schilling, *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 2131 (1998); *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 2141 (1998).
- [10] L. Fabbian, A. Latz, R. Schilling, F. Sciortino, P. Tartaglia and C. Theis, cond-mat/9812363 (1999), *Phys. Rev. E*, in press.; cond-mat/9905091 (1999) (*Phys. Rev. E*, in press).
- [11] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Thirumalai, *Phys. Rev. B* **36**, 5388 (1987), *ibid* **37**, 5342 (1988), *Phys. Rev. A* **37**, 4439 (1988), *J. Phys. A* **22**, L149 (1989).
- [12] E. Leutheusser, *Phys. Rev. A* **29**, 2765 (1984).
- [13] L. F. Cugliandolo and J. Kurchan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 173 (1993).
- [14] L. F. Cugliandolo and D. S. Dean, *J. Phys. A* **28**, L453 (1995).
- [15] L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan and L. Peliti, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, 3898 (1997).

- [16] J-P Bouchaud, L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan and M. Mézard, *Out of equilibrium dynamics in spin-glasses and other glassy systems*, in *Spin-glasses and random fields*, A. P. Young ed. (World Scientific, Singapore).
- [17] J-P Bouchaud, L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan and M. Mézard, J. Phys. A **226**, 243 (1996).
- [18] S. Franz and J. Hertz, Phys. Rev. Lett **74**, 2114 (1995).
- [19] G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3660 (1997).
- [20] W. Kob and J-L Barrat, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 4581 (1997).
- [21] J-L Barrat and W. Kob, Euro Phys. Lett., in press (1999).
- [22] W. Kob and J.L. Barrat, Euro. Phys. J. B, in press (1999); cond-mat/9905249 (1999).
- [23] M. Fuchs, I. Hofacker and A. Latz, Phys. Rev. A **45** 898 (1992).
- [24] L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan and P. Le Doussal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2390 (1996).
- [25] A. Latz, unpublished.
- [26] A. Latz, in preparation.
- [27] K. Kawasaki and J. D. Gunton, Phys. Rev. A **4**, 2048 (1973).
- [28] H. Grabert, in *Springer tracts in Modern Physics* **95**, ed. G. Höhler, (Springer Berlin, 1982).
- [29] H. Furukawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **62**, 70 (1979).
- [30] D. Bonn, H. Tanaka, G. Wegdam, H. Kellay and J. Meunier, Europhys. Lett. **45**, 52 (1998).